


v. County of Los Angeles, No. 23-55155, 2024 WL 2862587, at *2 (9th Cir. June 6, 2024) (unpublished mem.) (finding district court did not abuse its discretion in dismissing Doe defendants for plaintiff’s failure to timely serve them); *Grant v. Adventist Health Sys. Sunbelt Health Care Corp.*, 1:09-cv-0079, 2009 WL 6315308, at *1 (W.D.N.C. July 28, 2009) (noting Rule 4(m) has no exception for service of John Doe defendants). Otherwise, Plaintiff must seek, and “show[] good cause” for, an extension of the deadline. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m); *see also Adams v. AlliedSignal Gen. Aviation Avionics*, 74 F.3d 882, 887 (8th Cir. 1996) (explaining that “[a] showing of good cause requires at least ‘excusable neglect’—good faith and some reasonable basis for noncompliance with the rules”); *Myers v. Amrut Fusion LLC*, 4:25-cv-0209-MTS, 2025 WL 1555357, at *2 (E.D. Mo. June 2, 2025) (recognizing that “good cause” typically requires a showing of diligence); *Halvorsen v. Quantum Fin. & Bus. Intel.*, 4:24-cv-1497-MTS, ECF No. 6 (E.D. Mo. Mar. 5, 2025) (finding conclusory representations that plaintiff “diligently attempted to serve” defendant did not show good cause).

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to Serve a Third-Party Subpoena Prior to Rule 26(f) Conference, Doc. [5], is **GRANTED** in that Plaintiff may immediately serve its proposed subpoena in Amended Exhibit C. *See* Doc. [6].

Dated this 12th day of June 2025.



MATTHEW T. SCHELP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE